Advice request by NWW MS

Horizontal working group on the Landing Obligation

Paris, 2 February 2016



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR **NORTH WESTERN** LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES LAS AGUAS WATERS SEPTENTRIONALES **ADVISORY COUNCIL**

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA NOROCCIDENTALES

Advice on the Landing Obligation

1. Phasing; 2017,2018

- Send reply before deadline: 18th Dec 2015
- New proposal by MS group on Inter-Species Flexibility and phasing

Phasing: New proposal by MS group

Options 2017-2018 Pr	ros	Cons	Example
application for species which were already concernedpralready concernedLCby LO in 2016, in some fisheries by reducing/removing thresholds or meshfis tothresholds or meshEn size or to add newto	nable a rogression owards a "total" O for species and sheries onsidered nable to apply LO o vessels not yet oncerned	Less progressive than outlined in art. 15, risk's stakeholder criticism Complex array of rules especially if exemptions are awarded A number of vessels are concerned by several species with other vessels subjected to no LO rules. This situation could be exacerbated	 Reducing/removing thresholds: Whiting in English Channel & Celtic Sea N. lobster & hake in Celtic Sea Haddock in West of Scotland & Irish Sea Sole in English Channel & Celtic Sea

Phasing: New proposal by MS group

Options 2017-2018	Pros	Cons	Example
2) Extend LO to one or several species under quota not concerned in 2016	Enable to progress a "total" LO in a realistic way, in including new	Complex array of rules especially if exemptions are awarded	Species that could be added: - Anglerfish, megrim,
 For target species and fisheries concerned, in a first phase (2017?) For others species and fisheries, in a first phase (2018?) 	species by 2019 Extend the application to vessels not-yet-concerned by the LO Addresses industry concerns by avoiding a 'big bang' in 2019 by the gradual introduction of additional species	Might be necessary to introduce new thresholds for new species introduced	pollack - Deep sea species - Cod, saithe and plaice (only species listed in CFP, not yet concerned in 2016)

Phasing: New proposal by MS group

Options 2017-2018	Pros	Cons	Example
 3) Extend LO to métiers which were not concerned in 2016 Métiers not concerned by one LO in 2016 would be concerned gradually by 2019 A total extension would lead to a species approach (for some areas) 	Extends the application to vessels not yet concerned by the LO Enable to progress towards a "total" LO for all fisheries	Could be difficult to adopt because differences between MS in terms of species and fisheries Complex array of rules especially if exemptions are awarded	Fishing gear that could be added: - All nets targeting non quota species - Dredge

Advice on the Landing Obligation

2. De minimis; for new LO species in 2017

3. High survivability; specific cases for exemption

4. Documentation of catches; cases where documentation is hampered

Advice on the Landing Obligation

5. Minimum conservation reference sizes; adjustment, removal or introduction

6. Choke species; which species will choke first; possible solutions

7. Technical measures; aim to increase selectivity and reduce unwanted catches

Thank you



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES SEPTENTRIONALES Advisory Council

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA LAS ÁGUAS NOROCCIDENTALES